

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached Replacement Sheet of drawings includes changes to **Figure 4**. In **Figure 4**, previously omitted features and corresponding reference characters **431-433** have been added.

**Remarks**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22-28, and 30-38 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23, 30, and 31 have been amended. New claims 35-38 have been added. Support for these amendments and new claims can be found, for example, on page 14 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

**In the Specification**

The specification has been amended as shown above to include reference characters corresponding the processing engines and memory added to **Figure 4**. No new matter has been added.

**In the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because there is a lack of descriptive text legends for **Figure 1**. In particular, the Examiner refers to “37 CFR 1.83, CFR 1.84 [5(e)], MPEP § 608.02(e).” The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s objection.

As an initial matter, the applicants are confused by the reference to “CFR 1.84 [5(e)].” The applicants cannot find the referenced section. Clarification is requested. The applicants also note that MPEP § 608.02(e) makes no reference to descriptive text legends. 37 CFR §1.84(o) does state:

*Legends.* Suitable descriptive legends may be used subject to approval by the Office, or may be required by the examiner where necessary for understanding of the drawing. They should contain as few words as possible.

The applicants note that **Figure 1** does not need a legend. Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that the additional text suggested by the Examiner is not a descriptive text legend, and is therefore not required. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that **Figure 1** complies with the rules and that no amendment is needed.

The drawings are also objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In response, the applicants have amended **Figure 4** to include processing engines **431** and **432**, as well as memory **433**. Support for these changes can be found, for example, on page 9 of the specification. No new matter has been added.


Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Phaal, U.S. Patent No. 6,894,972. Claims 4, 12, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phaal in view of Flammer, U.S. Patent No. 5,488,608. Claims 6, 7, 13-15, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phaal in view of Kametani in view of Dietz. Claims 25, 31, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phaal in view of Blandy. Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phaal in view of Flammer and Hebb. Claims 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phaal in view of Hebb, Kametani and Dietz. Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phaal in view of Gollamudi.

The applicants respectfully submit the cited references fail to teach or suggest “creating a traffic information packet, wherein the traffic information packet includes a sampling mode field indicating the sampling algorithm used,” as required by independent claim 1 as amended and generally required by independent claims 9, 16, and 23 as amended. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 23 are allowable. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 31, and 35 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 10, 12, 13, 15, 32, and 36 depend from claim 9 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 17, 19, 20, 22, 33, and 37 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 24-28, 30, 34, and 38 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least this reason.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on Aug 31, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

8/31/06  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Marc R. Ascolese  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,268  
512-439-5085  
512-439-5099 (fax)